50th ANNIVERSARY YEAR

JULY
AUGUST
1973

WRL NEWS

Published by War Resisters League, 339 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y. 10012, U.S. branch of the War Resisters Intl., a pacifist organization with affiliates in 20 countries and individuals in more than 80 countries. Staff—Ralph DiGia, David McReynolds, Lynne Shatzkin Coffin, Editor—Jim Peck. Printed by the Grindstone Press, a Movement print shop. No. 177

SEE YOU AT ASILOMAR

. . . at the 50th anniversary conference August 5-7. WRL-West is geared to meet arriving delegates in San Francisco and get them transportation to the conference site, 120 miles southward. WRL-West is located at 833 Haight Street, Telephone (415) 626-6976. Among those planning to attend are Cesar Chavez, Dorothy Day, Daniel Ellsberg and Evan Thomas.

Fundraising For The Anniversary

"We missed the Anniversary party for WRL in Philadelphia because we were on vacation, but we plan to throw a little party here in Dover (Del.)," writes Fred Breukelman. "It will be a fund-raising party to which we shall invite people who have been active in some of our past peace efforts."

Dr. Nicholas Roby of Philadelphia writes: "I am planning on sending fund-raising notes to each of my 10 friends to whom I sent calendars. Also, I am planning a large fund-raiser with a showing of anti-war movies.

Both these letters were in response to a special memo on fund-raising sent recently to our key list. What kind of a fund-raising affair can you initiate to help meet our current $30,000 deficit?

STARTING WITH A RALLY AT THE WATERGATE . . .

photo by Bradford Lyttle

. . . some 2500 demonstrators, with placards focusing on the Cambodia bombing, marched first to the White House, where they paused for a rally, and then to the Department of Justice, for a final rally. According to the Pentagon's own statistics, the total of 175,000 tons dropped during the past *four months* equals the total dropped in Cambodia during the *three years* preceding the Vietnam ceasefire. The rate of 47,000 tons a month compares with 36,000 tons dropped on North Vietnam during the December onslaught in which the Bach Mai hospital was demolished.

WRL ACCUSES U.S. OF '69 BREAK-IN

"WRL charges that we are one of the early victims of the Nixon Administration's para-military operations against its citizens." So said WRL Chairperson Irma Zigas in an opening statement at a press conference July 2, called to announce that the League is taking legal action. She was referring to the break-in at the WRL office, May 9, 1969, in which the League's membership files were stolen.

Mel Wulf, chief attorney for ACLU, explained to the assembled reporters that the 1969 break-in now will be included in a damage suit against the FBI filed a year ago in Philadelphia. Based on the political documents ripped-off from the FBI office in Media, Pa. in 1971, the suit cites the FBI's spying on the WRI 1969 Triennial Conference in Haverford. (The complete collection of these political documents is included in the March 1972 special issue of *WIN* still available from us for $1 apiece, 50¢ in quantities of 10 or more.)

WRL's decision to take legal action was prompted by revelation, in connection with the Watergate investigation, that illegal government break-ins occurred as far back as 1969. One 1969 break-in, at the *Washington Free Press,* was described in testimony May 30 by two former Army intelligence operatives, who said they had acted at the request of FBI agents. The frequency of illegal government break-ins was pointed out in the June 11 issue of *Newsweek,* which said: "Senate probers . . . have been told by high Administration officials that illicit methods—including burglary and unauthorized wiretaps—were widely used to stop sensitive leaks, to monitor the domestic Left and gather information for the prosecution of cases against radicals. The investigators have been told specifically that burglaries were committed in connection with the Seattle Seven, Chicago Weatherpeople, Detroit Thirteen and Berrigan cases."

OMITTED–BY MISTAKE–FROM 1973 LITERATURE LIST

(The list was enclosed with the last issue of *WRL News*.)

ENOUGH OF DYING. The Kay Boyle-Justine Van Gundy compilation of famous *Voices for Peace* including Denise Levertov, Allen Ginsberg, Albert Camus, Malcolm X, etc. $1.25

THE SIMPLE ART OF MURDER, a NARMIC pamphlet by Eric Prokosch on antipersonnel weapons and their developers. $1

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF POWER. "What price do we pay, politically and morally, once we let ourselves be controlled?" Ronald Sampson answers, in detail. $1.95

WHAT CAN YOU DO ABOUT THIEU'S PRISONERS? Leaflet, $2.00 for 100.

NOT ON THE 1973 LITERATURE LIST (because few WRLers are likely to plunk down *$15* for a book) but available from us at that price is **CORE–A STUDY IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT 1942-1968** by August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, two Kent State professors. It is the *only* book which gives a complete, minutely-detailed history of the most successful utilization of nonviolent direct action in American history. *Though WRLers may not be ready to pay $15, they should make sure that their local library gets the book.*

ENROLLMENT BLANK

Send to War Resisters League
339 Lafayette Street, N. Y., N.Y. 10012

WAR IS A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY.
I THEREFORE AM DETERMINED NOT TO SUPPORT ANY KIND OF WAR, INTERNATIONAL OR CIVIL, AND TO STRIVE FOR THE REMOVAL OF ALL THE CAUSES OF WAR

signature

address

city

state *zip code*

LOCAL ORGANIZING – A REPORT

by Lynne Shatzkin Coffin

As we approach the Fifth Annual WRL Conference, which will mark the Fiftieth Anniversary of the War Resisters League, it makes sense to take time to examine our strategies for nonviolent revolution in America.

War Resisters League has placed increasing emphasis on local organizing in the last four years and has seen the building of local and regional WRL groups as one of the major tasks for the organization and as an important component of our long term strategy. At the present time we have close to thirty local groups with four regional offices in Albuquerque, New Mexico; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; and a new office in Kansas City, Missouri. Our local groups include places such as Honolulu, Hawaii; Denton, Texas; and Asbury Park, New Jersey. New groups are in the process of forming, and it seems that the "life expectancy" of local groups has increased, with many local groups already in existence for several years and still going strong with active participation from WRL members in their area. Our local groups are no longer a few college students, isolated from the community and subject to the pressures of rapid change-over in personnel, but rather people of all ages and backgrounds who have come together to learn from each other and to put down the roots of nonviolent social change in the community in which they live by engaging in a variety of projects and activities.

For example, in Atlanta, Georgia, the WRL Southern Regional Office, the Wingates have formed a local study group which includes people who range in age from early twenties to 76 years old. This group includes people who had never before explored the possibilities of nonviolent direct action as a means of creating social change and religious folks who, while they had been exposed to the message of nonviolence, had never heard the secular WRL side of the story. It also includes women who for the first time are questioning their traditional role and are exploring the possibilities of self-expression.

Another example of community action is the work that Craig Simpson is doing in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Not only are Craig and the members of his group active in questions regarding Atomic Testing and the military, but they are seeking to follow the statement in the WRL Pledge that reads, " . . . and strive for the removal of all the causes of war." To this end they are active in labor struggles such as the United Farm Workers, and have accomplished such projects as organizing a Child Care Center for local community people. They have also been active in creating a Southwestern network of local activists and groups which regularly publish a newsletter to facilitate communication in their area. Regional Conferences and coordinated regional projects have taken place and have been stronger because of the participation of *all* nonviolent activists in the Southwest, rather than only WRL members and supporters. Direct Action, the War Resisters League local group in Austin, Texas, and Denton, Texas WRL have been active participants in this project, along with other WRL groups in the Southwestern Region.

Most WRL Local and Regional groups are also coordinating projects on the Political Prisoners situation in South Vietnam, Amnesty, and are continuing their work on Indochina.

It is our hope that these activities will continue and expand with the addition of new local groups and our new regional office in Kansas City, Missouri. Sometime in the Fall, Igal Roodenko, past Chairman of War Resisters League, will tour this region that we are calling the "Plains States Region." The tour will include Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa. We hope that through local organizing we will be able to reach into the heart of the United States and clearly state a message of nonviolence through direct contact with *people*. There is no better way to spread our message and all the mail and telephone contact in the world cannot substitute for direct, personal appeal.

In August, at the Fifth Annual WRL Conference in Asilomar, California, we will explore the question of local organizing and share experiences with representatives of local groups. We hope that through this process we will be able to find creative ways to increase our impact and explore possibilities through which the WRL National Office can increase its aid to this process. It seems clear that with our local groups growing in numbers and in strength and with the increase of participation of local community people in these groups that the WRL network for local organizing will continue to grow and strengthen and that we will be able to approach the achievement of our long range goals.

If you are interested in forming a local group, please contact me at the National Office. We will do all we can to help you. Also, if you are interested in finding out about local War Resisters League groups in your area, *WIN Magazine* publishes the complete list of all WRL local and regional groups every two weeks on their back cover.

I hope to see many of you at the Asilomar Conference in August. If you can't make it and have any questions or suggestions on local organizing, be sure to contact me in the National Office.

BREZHNEV COMES TO TOWN

By David McReynolds

There is surely no member of the War Resisters League who wants to bring back the good old days of the Cold War. And, whatever our views on Richard Nixon may be (and they are, one can assume, not favorable), very few Americans would detract from his leadership in restoring something close to favorable relations with both the Peoples Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

It may be ironic that the man who was in large part an architect of the Cold War, and who based so much of his political career on a professional anti-Communism, should prove to be the very person slowly dismantling that structure. One may wish Nixon had moved sooner, one may feel that recognition of China might have been as logical in 1949 as in 1972, but these are quibbles. The fact is that Nixon has taken giant steps in his visits to Peking and Moscow, and that he has consolidated his position by hosting Brezhnev this past June.

But it is not enough to rejoice, it is essential also to analyze. This article is not in any sense an attack on the detente, but a discussion of its implications. However unpleasant Nixon may be personally, the detente is the landmark of his career, and not even Watergate can destroy it. However, clearly there are unpleasant aspects of the detente. Brezhnev arrived in Washington just in time to help prop up a tottering President. There could be no greater irony than that Nixon, arch-conservative and red-baiter for most of his political life, found his ally in Brezhnev. One must recall with some bitterness that last year Nixon was welcomed in Peking while American bombers smashed North Vietnam, and welcomed in Moscow shortly after the mining of North Vietnamese harbors.

Reports from Russia indicate that the current detente has increased internal political repression in the Soviet Union. What has occurred is not a new era of tolerance and goodwill—the cultural exchanges notwithstanding—but a carefully calculated set of moves by the world's superpowers to re-arrange the military and political balance.

Until the recent past the world was dominated by the United States. Japan and Western Europe were our subordinate allies. Russia, while it had the capacity to destroy the West in a military encounter, was certainly not its equal. China was a developing power with limited capacity for any attack on its neighbors. But times have changed and the Brezhnev-Mao-Nixon visits reflect those changes. First, the Vietnam war did literally bankrupt the United States. Something close to two hundred *billion* dollars flowed down the drain. In addition, the U.S. has been spending close to *eighty billion* dollars each year in a defense budget, while Japan and Western Europe have had only minimal defense expenditures. The result has been that the world's balance of power has shifted drastically. Japan, free of the need for military investment, has used its resources to compete with—and surpass—the United States. While our billions have gone into "cost plus contracts" for military hardware, the Japanese have been building stereo sets, hi-fi equipment, computers—and beating the pants off their American competition. Similarly Western Europe, while politically divided, has been able to out-compete and outproduce the U.S. Less than 30 years ago Europe was prostrated by war, its factories demolished, its people starving. Today it competes successfully with us with everything from cards to aircraft.

The American dollar, long considered the most solid currency on the face of the earth, has twice been officially devalued and in recent weeks as it "floated," has undergone a third devaluation of 5% to 10%. (The dollar has, within a year, dropped about 30% of its face value.)

Thus the Soviet/Chinese detente comes at a time when the world has moved toward five power centers. Where once the world was bi-polar—with Russia and the United States playing the roles of super powers—it is now multi-polar, with two Communist giants vying for power and, arrayed against them, three capitalist formations, Western Europe, Japan, and the United States. It was essential in this new situation for China to secure itself against any Soviet surprise attack, thus Peking's welcome to Nixon. And it was necessary for Russia to guarantee itself against any possible U.S.-Sino alliance. These considerations made Vietnam—the bombing of it and the mining of its harbor—a minor concern to the two Communist super powers.

One must expect that both the new power of Japan and the power of the European Common Market will make themselves felt in the months to come. Those who see in these developments a movement toward greater international security are probably wrong. Traditionally a game with two players is easy to predict and to control. It is when the number of players increases that the role of unpredictability increases. What has happened, therefore, is that a re-arrangement of power is occurring and that in this re-arrangement there is a greater rather than a lesser danger of a nuclear explosion.

Again, clearly the WRL welcomes every possible exchange between nations. We can only applaud any move toward detente. But what does alarm us is the Defense Department's statement that it contemplates no cut back in funds as a result of the Brezhnev visit. Nor is there any indication the Chinese or Soviet budgets are to be reduced. Nor is there any indication that there will be any internal relaxation of political terror as a consequence of the new relaxed international situation.

In short, the threat powers, for reasons of their own, have reached new accommodations. It remains for us, as pacifists, to point out that so long as these great powers remain armed with nuclear weapons, they pose a continuing threat to every living person. Brezhnev smiled, drank champagne, asked for massive capitalist credits, but made no move toward withdrawing Soviet troops from Eastern Europe. Nixon smiled, drank champagne, talked of cultural exchanges, but made no move toward ending our involvement in Cambodia, or cutting military aid to South Vietnam, or cutting our own arms budget.

In short, while these men met and laughed and exchanged pleasantries, the peoples of the planet, our own citizens among them, continue to pay the high price of an arms race which leaves us diseased, poorly housed, hungry.

Let us, as pacifists, remember that we must be wise as serpents, gentle as doves. We support every move toward disarmament. We will take all risks, suffer all humiliation, be called all names in order to advance the cause of peace. *But,* though the world at times may view us as naive, still it is our obligation to deal with reality and to see in the Nixon-Brezhnev meeting something as cold and hard as the copulation of rattlesnakes. Not a single bomb has been defused, not a single dollar re-directed toward the starving, not a single door open toward freer exchange of ideas. Do we welcome summit meetings? Of course! Who could oppose them? But our demands extend far beyond the exchange of champagne toasts: we demand actual disarmament; we demand true freedom; we demand an end of shifting alliances by great powers and the beginning of a world in which men and women are linked by trust, not coerced by guns.

WRI GETS CONSULTATIVE STATUS AT UN

By Beverly Woodward

In early May, War Resisters International, the pacifist international with which WRL is affiliated, was granted category II status as a nongovernmental organization (NGO) at the United Nations. This resulted from an effort initiated more than a year ago by Devi Prasad, along with a little fancy international footwork.

WRI's first serious contacts with the United Nations occurred in 1968, the year designated as UN International Human Rights Year. At that time Devi, then General Secretary of WRI, decided to use the opportunity presented by this occasion to launch an international campaign for the recognition of conscientious objection as a human right. Some 40,000 signatures from 17 countries were gathered on a petition entitled a *World Appeal for A Recognition of Conscientious Objection as a Human Right*, which was delivered to the Human Rights Division at the UN on the 22nd anniversary of the death of Gandhi, January 30, 1970.

Such petitions tend to gather dust unless followed up by further efforts. Fortunately, therefore, Eileen Egan, who represents Pax Romana at the UN and who has long been close to WRL and WRI, took steps which resulted in the subject of conscientious objection coming before the Commission on Human Rights at the UN. In 1971, the Commission, after protracted debate, voted to ask the Secretary-General to make a worldwide study of practices with regard to compulsory military service and provision for conscientious objection and alternative service.

This spring the Secretary-General's report was finally presented to the Commission. At the same time, The Netherlands and Austria introduced a resolution aimed at encouraging all UN members to make provision for the right to conscientious objection and for appropriate alternative service. But largely due to the interventions of the USSR, which argued that such action by the UN would constitute an unacceptable interference into the domestic affairs of states, a vote on this resolution was deferred until next year.

Consequently, it was a strange twist when another delegate from the USSR played an important role in gaining category II status for WRI at the UN. It started with a sort of accident. When WRI's application was first being discussed, the USSR delegate looked at the wrong papers and recommended a lower status for WRI (giving it fewer possibilities of action at the UN). When he discovered his error, he was determined to rectify it and at a subsequent meeting argued forcefully for category II status. International politics being what they are, this immediately aroused the suspicions of certain Western delegates. The result was a decision to postpone a vote on WRI until the delegates could inform themselves better as to "just what kind" or an organization WRI was. Igal Roodenko, who was representing WRI at these meetings, was, of course, delighted to pass around literature indicating WRI's consistent stand against the use of violence wherever it occurs.

The upshot was a rather ironic speech in behalf of WRI at the next meeting by the delegate from The Netherlands. He reported that his delegation had found WRI to be an organization which advocated "in a remarkably even-handed manner" nonviolent resistance to *all* imperialisms and *all* wars and then quoted from a statement issued by WRI at the time of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in which mention was made of "the reactionary and repressive role played by the two military alliances, the Warsaw Pact and NATO." He therefore wished to compliment the Soviet delegate for his broadmindedness in this matter! Fortunately the Soviet delegate decided not to change his stand. He accused the Dutch delegate of "confusing" the issue, said what was involved was just a technical question concerning whether WRI met the criteria for category II status, and reaffirmed his position. Thus with support from East and West WRI was admitted to consultative status at the UN.

The question now will be what we shall do with this status. The WRI Council at its recent meeting in St. Louis, France, voted that I should be the WRI representative at the UN. Unfortunately, however, the pressures of other business prevented the Council from considering in a substantive way relations between WRI and the UN, so it may be helpful if I present here a few of my own ideas as a starting point for further discussion.

Everyone, of course, knows the weaknesses of the UN and many may question whether any efforts at all in this forum are worthwhile. I think so, since I am a firm believer in the importance of strengthening transnational ties, especially ties among the less advantaged, and the UN is one forum where this is occurring in a significant way. While the major powers are canceling each other out in the Security Council, the Third World, the nonaligned countries, and some of the smaller European countries have been forging various alliances in the General Assembly and some of the special committees. At the same time they are developing a global *Weltanschauung* quite different from the worldview of the major powers with their essentially 19th century visions of "balance of power" world order arrangements. At the last session of the General Assembly a delegate from Malaysia made a statement that may be taken as representative: "While the *detente* between and among the major powers is welcome, it can well lead to a period of big Power collusion in which there would exist a multipolar world broken up into spheres of influence. A non-polar world with democratized conduct of international relations is the ideal to be sought."

To be sure, whether this ideal can be realized without some rather drastic changes in the nation-state as an institution and in the United Nations itself (which in fact may have to be replaced with an organization structured quite differently) is the next question that will have to be faced. The Third World still being much under the grip of nationalism (which, of course, need not be a wholly retrogressive force), it will probably be some time before really imaginative alternatives to present arrangements are proposed. National sovereignty seems too precious as a way of combating the imperious and imperial behavior of the superpowers for the smaller and less powerful nations to be willing to consider what look like derogations from it. Still this is only part of the picture. Functional cooperation, unlike anything existing in the past, is already occurring and the democratic ideal may yet lead to unusual initiatives.

I am stressing these structural concerns and the capacity of the UN to be a forum where new conceptions of world community and world order may develop, because I think they are of central importance to the effort to eliminate war. To put the matter strongly: the causes of war lie in the present insane social, economic and political organization of the world. Given the interdependence of humankind and the growing world population, the overcoming of the existing destructive institutional arrangements does not lie in withdrawal into small autonomous communities (though such attempts may have certain positive features), but in the forging of new kinds of ties on a regional and global basis, ties that are based on a recognition of our mutual responsibility for human life everywhere.

The UN is *one* forum, though certainly not the only one,

(continued next page)

A WRI RESOLUTION ON TODAY'S KEY ISSUES

Editor's Note–The following statement was introduced at the WRI Council meeting (May 25-June 1) by David McReynolds. It is intended to serve as a statement of "political clarification," and was worked over carefully by Jean Van Lierde of Belgium, and by others. At the express request of the Council, the full text is being carried in WRL News *and in the publications of other WRI sections around the world. For members of the League concerned, a few copies of a private report on the Council meeting are still available from our office–send 10¢.*

The WRI is an international organization whose members and national sections are united by their opposition to war in all circumstances and their commitment to fight for the removal of its causes. Inevitably, differences in the analysis of particular situations and priorities to be pursued will arise at times.

Obviously, the fact that we refuse to be aligned with any nation state or power-bloc does not mean that we are neutral or that we avoid making distinctions between the internal social structures and national policies of various states. Our rejection of violence does not imply neutrality in struggles that occur. There is a clear difference, ethical and political, between the Hungarians and the Czechoslovakians seeking to free their peoples from control in terms of liberated socialism and on the other hand the Soviet army seeking to maintain domination. There is a clear difference between the Indochinese resorting to violence to expel the French and then the Americans from their homeland and the colonialist forces seeking control of their country.

We stated in the Vienna meeting of the WRI Council, 1968, in the resolution on *Liberation Movements and the WRL:*

> " . . . our unwavering commitment to nonviolence does not mean that we are hostile to the revolutionary movements of our time, even though on certain fundamental issues we may disagree with some of them. It is impossible for us to be morally 'neutral,' for example, in the struggle between the people of Vietnam and the American government . . . We do not support the violent *means* used by the NLF and Hanoi, but we do support their *objective* in seeking the liberation of Vietnam from foreign domination."

However, in view of recent political discussions within the International it is appropriate for this Council Meeting to reaffirm the WRI position on several matters and request each section to publish the full text of this statement in a publication going to all their members.

1. Nuclear weapons are in and of themselves a threat to humanity. Several nation-states now possess nuclear weapons and we condemn and oppose the nuclear policies of each and every one of them. Furthermore, we emphasize that the means which are necessary for the productions of weapons of all kinds, hinder the ethical, spiritual and material development of humankind.
2. A criminal act against humanity does not cease to be criminal by becoming collective. It is no excuse for one nuclear power to point to other nation-states with similar weapons. Obviously we would support universal disarmament, but the WRI commits itself to inciting people to take unilateral nonviolent action against their respective oppressive state-bureaucracies and their war machinery in their struggle for liberation.
3. We condemn all military pacts and alliances and continue to call for their dissolution as well as for the unilateral withdrawal of members. Such alliances have been used, particularly by the USA and the USSR, as masks behind which their own national and international policies could be carried out.
4. We appeal to all nation-states to recognize the right of conscience in regard to military service. In many nation-states both in the East and the West there is no legal recognition of conscientious objectors and political resisters to particular wars. We oppose conscription wherever it exists. No nation-state can justify military conscription of men and women or imposing forced labor as an alternative service.
5. We call for the release from prisons everywhere in the world of all those held for reasons of political, religious or ethical beliefs. No nation-state can claim to be free, as does the United States, or progressive, as does the Soviet Union, when men and women are detained, held without trial, tortured, or jailed solely on the basis of their beliefs and political positions.
6. The WRI condemns imperialism and global domination, militarism and state military intervention as well as the repression of national, ethnic and religious minorities by all nation-state administrations, including the United States and the USSR.

The development of nuclear weapons has introduced a new dimension into war by making possible the total destruction of mankind. To this extent, pacifist opposition to war, however insufficient, has become critically important and its failure thus far to introduce historically relevant alternative forms of social organization is disastrous.

We know that various sections of the WRI will differ in their strategies and tactics. They will also differ on their evaluation of the social systems of the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, the United States of America, etc.

But we believe that the sections should hold to the points laid down in this resolution.

WRI AT UN continued

where it is possible to pursue actively a vision of world community based on mutual responsibility, respect for fundamental human rights, and egalitarian institutional arrangements. Efforts within this forum, therefore, should be *one* part of a serious program to realize this vision. We may be realistic about the UN and its limitations without turning our backs on it and the possibilities it offers.

In the immediate future there are numerous specific areas of UN concern where it is especially appropriate that WRI be active. They include disarmament, a halt to nuclear testing, the creation of unarmed world peacekeeping units, the elimination of torture, and the aforementioned concern with the rights of conscientious objectors. In later reports I shall discuss possible WRI initiatives within the UN in these areas as well as grass roots actions that might be undertaken in their support. In addition I hope to have suggestions and comments from you.

ATLANTA REPORT

by Jerry Wingate

The Atlanta Workshop in Nonviolence has engaged in a variety of activities since the beginning of the year. One of our most important projects is an effort to build a strong community of support and action among the permanent residents of Atlanta. That is an easy phrase to type, but in actuality it represents an enormous struggle in a region where the military and its influence as well as cultural pressures toward conformity are mountainous obstacles. The core of this effort is educational; that is, workshops, seminars, etc., designed to present pacifist thought and rhetoric for analysis and relate ideas to community action. Our most important on-going seminar is now one year old and meets every Tuesday night for a pot luck dinner and discussions on nonviolence. It usually attracts 15 to 30 people and has involved a number of folks in direct action projects and sensitized others to nonviolent lifestyles.

In January, we initiated a project to raise money (and consciousness) for relief work in Vietnam. We organized a coalition of groups and concerned people and managed to collect several thousand dollars. Half of that money went to Medical Aid to Indochina for the Bach Mai hospital in Hanoi and the other half went to the Unified Buddhist Church in Vietnam for relief work in the South.

After the signing of the "Peace Accords," we concerned ourselves with the issue of political prisoners in Thieu's jails. We built a model "tiger cage" and took it to several public gatherings including a congressional hearing held by Congressman Andy Young. We also obtained a rather long list of prisoners and have been distributing the names to folks interested in checking upon the persons whose name they have been assigned.

March and April found us working closely with SCLC organizing the Poor People's Spring Offensive and actions surrounding the fifth anniversary of Martin King's assassination. Local activities included a 4 day vigil at King's gravesite, campus teach-ins on the Nixon Budget and Revenue Sharing, community marches and vigils and a mass march on April 4 that drew several thousand people. April 15 was an occasion to talk with a number of Atlantans who have refused all or part of their Federal income tax. We also counseled quite a few people who were caught in a local crackdown on telephone tax refusers.

Lately, we have been putting much energy into the amnesty issue. Thanks to a little help from our friends, we were able to have a presence at four amnesty conferences in the last month–New York, Washington and Toronto. We are working with a local coalition in building a Southern regional amnesty conference here in Atlanta over the weekend of July 14 and 15.

Of course, no work should be without a little celebration and on March 31 about 70 people showed up for a joint birthday party for 50 year old WRL and 6 year old AWIN. We sent a piece of birthday cake off to Henry and Sue Bass (founders of AWIN now living in Boston) and we were instructed to send all of our brothers and sisters of the League hearty greetings and solidarity!

PROTESTS FRENCH A-TESTS

With a placard in French and one in English saying "Stop A-Bomb Tests In The Pacific," Jim Peck pickets the French aircraft carrier Foch during public visiting hours on June 3, Pier 97, New York. Also on display were the guided missile cruiser Colbert and the destroyer Bouvet.

Worldwide protest action against this summer's French tests include the Australian Council of Trade Unions' complete boycott of trade and communications with France, the British trade unions' one-week boycott, and Australia's and New Zealand's attempt for an injunction from the world Court in the Hague. In addition to several private protest vessels, a New Zealand Navy frigate, assisted by an Australian Navy supply vessel are at the Mururoa test area.

AMNESTY COUNCIL TARGETING AT FALL ACTION

The National Council for Universal & Unconditional Amnesty, formed at a nationwide Washington conference in early May, presently is aiming toward action mobilization in October. WRL has given the Council office space and a fulltime staff person is being sought.

A June 26 steering committee meeting discussed coordination of the over 50 member groups across the country, working areas, production and circulation of literature and an amnesty newsletter. The steering committee, composed of 6 persons who would be direct recipients of amnesty and 6 representatives of groups, includes Walter Collins (Natl. Black Draft Counseling), Virginia Collins (SCEF), Ed Damato (VVAW), Chick Judd (NCC), Bob Musil (CCCO), Sandra Rutherford (Vancouver Exile Union), Henry Schwarzschild (ACLU), Trudi Young (CALC), Dee Knight (AMEX-Canada), Jeff Hayes (Ft. Meade Military Project), Jean Friedman (Campaign for Amnesty-San Francisco) and Irma Zigas (WRL).

AMNESTY: WHY? FOR WHOM?
David McReynolds' pamphlet, finally has arrived from the printer. Back orders are being filled and future orders will be shipped promptly. The price–20¢ apiece, $10 per 100.

PETER KIGER IN MEDICAL SCHOOL

WRL News readers who noticed in the January-February issue that Peter Kiger had left the staff to resume his medical studies, will be interested to learn that he recently was admitted to Tufts.

Gaining admission was very difficult in light of the 10-year hiatus during which Peter worked fulltime in the peace movement. He had applied to a large number of medical schools without success.

ELECTION RESULTS

The following people have been elected to the Executive Committee: Jerry Coffin, Sybil Claiborne, William Douthard, Larry Erickson, and Jerry Elmer. Re-elected to the Executive Committee were Bent Andresen, Norma Becker, Prafulla Mukerji, and Igal Roodenko. National Committee members elected were Robert Rovinsky and Beverly Woodward from the Eastern Region; Don Bender and Law Wilson from the Southern Region; Larry Gara, Vic Schumacher, and Robert Calvert from the Midwestern Region; and Betty Brantner and Sue Gottfried from the Western Region.